

Weekly OCII and SFDPH Conference Call Talking Points

12:15 pm-1:00 pm, Telephone

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

August 9, 2021 | Internal Use Only

<u>San Francisco Department of Public Health</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Amy Brownell, Hunters Point Lead- Patrick Fosdahl, Director Environmental Health	<u>Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Kasheica McKinney, Hunters Point Project Manager
--	---

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for August 9.

Today's Participants – Yolanda, Amy, Kasheica

Communications/Meetings

- **Media:**

- Nothing of interest

- **Community events/interest:**

- **Application for a preliminary injunction to halt development on Parcel A** – any news from the court date set for July 29? No news?
- **Env & Reuse Subcommittee of HPS CAC** – Navy plans to present on August 23, right? Any other meetings this month?
- **Elective radiological screening on Parcel A** – Is there an update on the fieldwork to perform the elective radiological testing on Block 56 (affordable housing site)? Plans are moving forward to mobilize in Oct.
- **Complaints about site access to HPNS:** Dr. Sumchai recently sent a letter to the Navy about site access. We have had some ongoing requests for the Navy to communicate its site security program. Last month, Kasheica mentioned the Navy might be working with Five-Point on trying to strengthen the security, such as 100% badge check, and a notice would be sent out to the tenants. Navy did respond to Dr. Sumchai last month, noting “the entirety of Parcel E-2 is fenced... signs are posted along perimeter fences as a warning, and as a deterrent to trespassing (and regular security patrols). While these signs are sometimes stolen, we are increasing our efforts to keep them in place and replace them when necessary... unfortunately... trespassers choose to illegally cut the fence and gain access to this property.”
- **Title VI complaint against SFDPH and BAAQMD on dust issues at Parcel A** – The complaint against SFDPH has been dismissed; the complaint against BAAQMD has been accepted for further investigation. It's around the deadline for BAAQMD to respond to EPA's “preliminary findings” letter to this complaint sent in June, concluding:
 - There is insufficient evidence to support a finding that BAAQMD discriminated in its response to the air quality complaint.
 - BAAQMD is not meeting its longstanding legal obligations with respect to nondiscrimination program requirements, such as having in place nondiscrimination safeguards and ensuring meaningful access to its services, activities, and programs, including the public participation program, for people with limited English proficiency and people with disabilities.

Internal Use Only - Deliberative

- Questions about access to Candlestick Park – *Hip Hop for Change* recently met with EPA's Office of EJ and described concerns about the BVHP community's access to this park (resource). Future event? Kasheica mentioned this is a state park and the city may not have much access.
- Navy's meeting with the SF Shipyard residents' group –
- Urine Screening: Any hope on the Navy addressing this? Dr. S also started a "Go Fund Me" campaign to raise money for more urine screening work.
- EPA/Navy letters community involvement: In November, the Navy committed to doing an evaluation of its community outreach and involvement program, starting in March. We recently asked the Navy for an update and they said they would have a contract in place in May. Then, we recently heard from the Navy they were doing a CIP update that would include this evaluation.
- *Never Surrender: The Fight for EJ in BVHP*: There was another showing of the documentary on March 16, which included a panel (BVHP's Michele Pierce was a panelist).
- Meeting with AA Carlton Waterhouse and members of the public on radiological building RGs – PEER, Committee to Bridge the Gap, Michele Pierce, Kim Rhoads, and ??
- BVHP Family Histories Study – Amy called the number to get a copy of the flyer.
- **Congressional interest:** Letter? No more major delays; adequate funding.
- **FOIA:** Our site attorneys are working on two new FOIAs from Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER). The first is on the submarine piers and marine pins background numbers, and it appears the Navy also received a request. The second one is on the RGs for buildings.
- **SF Supervisors:** We will probably reach out to Supervisor Walton later this month when we are ready to respond to the Navy's latest RESRAD runs. Do we know Supervisor Walton's role in the BAAQMD Agency convening letter (June 15)?

Parcel E and Asbestos-containing material (ACM): In late 2020, the Navy shared it had stopped work at Parcel E, because of suspected ACM. They are continuing to analyze the situation and we expect an update soon. Recently, DTSC sent a letter to the Navy and EPA also responded with support on the issues raised. *The Navy hasn't scheduled a meeting on this topic.*

IR10 Building Letter from EPA: In May, the Navy requested an extension to the RAWP and Karen responded with a letter expressing concern about plans to take away the SVE system near Building 123. Amy has asked EPA to retract the letter "to remove the assertions from the public record since the RAWP document hasn't been issued so there isn't any basis for the assertions." From the public perception issue, Amy is concerned about premature concerns raised (the RAWP hasn't happened).

- What do you mean by the "public record"? via a FOIA or information request.
- Perhaps a conversation is a better approach.

Internal Use Only - Deliberative

Parcel G Building RGs Long-term Protectiveness Evaluation: This Thursday, Enrique, Laura, DTSC, and CDPH will meet to discuss the ongoing informal dispute between the Navy and EPA on the radiological remediation goals for buildings.

- The Navy has moved to finalize the FYR addendum.
- The Navy's April deliverable attempted to address concerns EPA raised in our August 2020 letter. We responded and the Navy replied with three suggestions. We responded on Thursday suggesting the best approach is to validate some of the assumptions once in the field.
- We are evaluating this information and continue to meet with the Navy's technical team. We are optimistic about the information we are learning that most of the RGs are in the risk range. Although, there is some work left to do about the ingestion (removable fraction).
- In March, there had been discussion on concerns about using onsite buildings to establish background reference building. The Navy expressed an openness to use an offsite building that would be of similar vintage (1940s-50s) with similar building materials (sheet rock, wood, metals, etc.).
- In April, we discussed whether demolishing the buildings prior to transfer should be a discussion at an upcoming Transfers meeting. In our back-and-forth emails with the Navy over the following three months, the Navy noted it would cost \$300 million to demolish the buildings. A long time ago, there were discussions about the developer demolishing the buildings prior to transfer; however, it is a different environment now? Should this be a topic of discussion at the Transfers meeting (June)?
- We continue to encourage the Navy to send the requested information to substantiate the claims of background levels and technical impracticability of implementing the numbers EPA shared in August. The Navy shared some information, which we find deficient to answer these important questions.
- We haven't seen an example of the use of RESRAD for potentially radiologically-contaminated buildings to be determined appropriate for residential use. We really need to ensure the tools properly model exposure pathways for a child in a residential yard. Last month, Kasheica mentioned the developers asking how the conversation is moving forward.

Parcel G radiological retesting soil fieldwork: In May, the Navy resumed fieldwork after being on pause since December, and EPA has begun our field oversight and split sampling, alongside the state. Phase 1 is on pace to be completed soon. Phase 2 is scheduled to start in November.

- **Strontium-90.** The sampling results from Parcel G are presenting Strontium-90.
 - Based on the background study, we didn't expect to see strontium-90 detections. (For example, there were no detections of strontium-90 in over 200 background samples.)
 - Strontium-90 is presenting in 10% of the sampling results. (Remember the Navy is only analyzing 10% of the total samples for strontium-90 and a few other radionuclides.)
 - However, there have been a couple of recent samples that appear to be above the cleanup goals for a radionuclide called strontium-90. We are working with the Navy to better understand those samples and how this may impact the next steps of the soil retesting work.
 - The bottom-line question is whether these results will trigger 100% excavation of the soil in Phase 2.
 - The Navy sent a tech memo in early July.
 - How will the Navy present the data at the Aug 23 HPS CAC meeting?

Internal Use Only - Deliberative

- Communicating schedule of radiological retesting to the public. In January, we asked the Navy to provide a consistent mechanism for updates to the public on the schedule. Any thoughts?
- The memorandum-to-the-file on background is final, although the Navy hasn't been too clear on how this document will be publicly accessible.
- Dust management and air monitoring: We continue to pay close attention to the Navy's implementation of its dust management and air monitoring plan. Although we have raised concerns on how the Navy is publicly sharing the data and urged the Navy to get appropriate meteorological equipment. Since September we continue to ask the Navy to obtain professional meteorological equipment (or stop the practice of subtracting upwind measurements). We have also pointed out where they are subtracting upwind measurements on low wind speed days, which is not the appropriate implementation of the Work Plan. In November, some of the air data numbers for short periods of time exceeded the 24-hour protective limits. We recently received this data and are looking into this.

Parcel D-1 ROD Amendment and LUC RD: Earlier this year, the Navy agreed this post-ROD change for Parcel D-1 will be a ROD Amendment. This will create a public participation process, and we are unclear on the timing and the plan of this. What are the city's thoughts on the public participation process of this ROD Amendment?